



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,365	12/21/2000	Jerry B. Decime	10002106-1	2157

7590 09/28/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

EL HADY, NABIL M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/746,365

Applicant(s)

DECIME, JERRY B.

Examiner

Nabil M El-Hady

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayyadurai (US 6,718,368) in view of Mowbray (EP 1 024447 A2).

4. As to claim 1, Ayyadurai discloses the invention substantially as claimed including an e-mail sorting and routing system for e-mail messages generated through a web-site or web-sites operated by a host organization (col. 1, lines 60-63), the system comprising: at least one web server for providing a web-site or web-sites at which clients generate e-mail messages to the host organization (col. 1, lines 60-63; and 3, Fig. 1); and at least one response server for sorting said e-mail messages (5, Fig. 1).

5. Ayyadurai discloses sorting the e-mail messages on the basis of well defined codes stored in the messages (col. 3, lines 1-3), sort e-mail messages based on their content, intent, need, and purpose (col. 3, lines 14-16), and classifying the messages (col. 3, lines 48-49, 60-62). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to view Ayyadurai's sorting and classifying to include sorting and classifying by language and sorting and classifying by topic with the motivation of expediting the time to response to the messages (col. 3, lines 14-16), and utilizing appropriate responders to the messages (col. 2, lines 1-3).

Art Unit: 2154

Mowbray, for example, discloses sorting e-mail messages by topic in a skilled-based routing system (abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Ayyadurai and Mowbray for the same kind of motivation, that is expediting the time to response to the messages, and utilizing appropriate responders to the messages.

6. As to claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above

7. As to claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 8 above.

8. As to claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 8, and 14 above, In addition, a computer-readable instructions recorded in a medium for storing computer-readable instructions, said instructions causing a computer system to sort and route e-mail messages generated through a web-site or web-sites operated by a host organization at which clients generate e-mail messages to the host organization, the instructions causing said computer system to: sort said e-mail messages by language, and subsequently, sort said e-mail messages by topic is inherent in Ayyadurai and Mowbray disclosures.

9. As to claims 2, 9, 15, and 19, Ayyadurai discloses the web-site appends meta-tags to each e-mail message, said meta-tags identifying a language and topic of that message, and wherein said at least one response server sorts said e-mail messages using said meta-tags (col. 4, lines 12-18).

Art Unit: 2154

10. As to claims 3, 4 and 10, Ayyadurai discloses a global mail box to which all messages generated at said web-site or web-sites are sent for sorting (col. 1, lines 64-65), said global mail box operates according to Post Office Protocol 3 (col. 4, lines 27-33).

11. As to claims 5, 11, 16, and 20, Ayyadurai and Mowbray do not specifically disclose a plurality of language-specific mail boxes into which said e-mail messages are sorted according to language. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to follow Mow bray's teaching of designating topic-specific mail boxes and designate language-specific mail boxes to contribute to the main motivation cited before of expediting the time to response to the messages, and utilizing appropriate responders to the messages.

12. As to claims 6, 12, 17, and 21, Mowbray discloses a plurality of topic-specific mail boxes into which said e-mail messages are sorted according to topic, each language-specific mail box being associated with a separate corresponding set of topic-specific mail boxes ([0008]).

13. As to claims 7 and 13, Ayyadurai and Mowbra y disclose a plurality of agent user interfaces, each of which is associated with a topic-specific mail box, wherein a user qualified as to language and topic uses one of said interfaces to access messages in the associated topic-specific mail box (Ayyadurai, col. 2, lines 1-3; Mowbray, abstract, and [0012]).

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Beauvois (US 6,556,671); Chack (US 6,496,580); Nelson et al. (US 5,937,422) ; Sassin et al. (US 6,058,435) ; Agusta (US 6,584,192); and Shtivelman et al. (US 6,263,066).

Art Unit: 2154

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M El-Hady whose telephone number is (703) 308-7990. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

September 21, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. El-Hady", with a long, sweeping flourish extending from the bottom right.

Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A.
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2154